



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,322	10/12/2001	Duc Pham	AESN3000	9241

23488 7590 03/14/2006

GERALD B ROSENBERG
NEW TECH LAW
285 HAMILTON AVE
SUITE 520
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,322

Applicant(s)

PHAM ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/03/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DE

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the aggregate performance". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claims 9 – 15 are rejected for their dependency on claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1 – 6, 8, 10 – 13, 16 – 18 and 21 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Almulhem et al. U.S. Patent No. 6587431 (hereinafter Almulhem).

8. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches a network data processor system comprising a plurality of data packet processors coupled through a data switch fabric between network connection processors, wherein said data packet processors perform a data processing function over data contained within predetermined data packets, wherein said network connection processors include network interfaces coupleable to external data transmission networks and wherein said network connection processors provide for the selective routing of said predetermined data packets through said data switch fabric to load balance the processing of said predetermined data packets by said plurality of data packet processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

9. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches a network data packet processor system providing for the transfer of packets between first and second networks, said network data packet processor system comprising:

10. a) a data packet switch including pluralities of first and second data ports coupled together to provide for the transfer of network data packets between respective first and second data ports, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44);

Art Unit: 2143

11. b) a plurality of data protocol processors coupled to a like plurality of said first data ports of said data packet switch, each data protocol processor being coupled to a respective first data port through a bidirectional packet transfer interface and including a protocol processing engine providing for the selective conversion of data contained within a predetermined network data packet, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44); and

12. b) input and output data transfer processors coupled to respective second data ports of said data packet switch, wherein said input data transfer processor selectively routes network data packets from said first network to said plurality of data protocol processors and said output data transfer processor routes network data packets from said plurality of protocol processors to said second network, and wherein said input data transfer processor balances the load of individual network data packets routed to said plurality of data protocol processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

13. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches a network gateway processor comprising:

14. a) a switch providing data routing between input, output, and processing ports, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 44, “rotator space switch”);

15. b) an array of protocol processors coupled to respective processing ports, each said protocol processor providing for the conversion of network data packets from a first form to a second form, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39);

16. c) an input processor coupled between a first network and said input port, said input processor providing for the load balanced allocation of network data packets received from said

Art Unit: 2143

first network to said array of protocol processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39); and

17. d) an output processor coupled between a second network and said output port, wherein said array of protocol processors provide network data packets of said second form to said output processor for transfer to said second network, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

18. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said input processor selectively associates conversion control data with network data packets provided to said array of protocol processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

19. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said conversion control data is provided with each network data packet provided to said array of protocol processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

20. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches each said protocol processor includes a data form conversion engine and wherein operation of said data form conversion engine is defined by predetermined parameters identified by said conversion control data and wherein said predetermined parameters are applied to said data form conversion engine with respect to a corresponding network data packet, (e.g., col. 7, lines 10 – 44 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39).

Art Unit: 2143

21. Referencing claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches a method of operating a network gateway coupleable between first and second networks to implement a compute intensive data processing function on network data packets transferred between said first and second networks, said method comprising:

22. a) receiving, by a first processor coupleable to said first network, network data packets, (e.g., col. 7, lines 22 – 55);

23. b) selecting, from said received network data packets, predetermined network packets for routing through said network gateway, (e.g., col. 7, lines 22 – 55);

24. c) selectively distributing said predetermined network data packets to a plurality of second processors so as to enable utilization of the aggregate performance of said second processors in performing said compute intensive data processing function, (e.g., col. 7, lines 22 – 55 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39);

25. d) processing, asynchronously, said predetermined network data packets as distributed by said plurality of second processors to convert each of said predetermined network data packets in accordance with said compute intensive data processing function to provide converted network data packets, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 29);

26. e) collecting, by a third processor coupleable to said second network, said converted network data packets, (e.g., col. 7, lines 22 – 55 & col. 8, lines 30 – 39); and

27. f) transferring said converted network data packets to said second network, (e.g., col. 8, lines 45 – 59).

Art Unit: 2143

28. Referencing claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said compute intensive data processing function is dependent on configuration parameters and wherein said method further comprising the steps of;

29. a) obtaining said configuration parameters, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 30); and

30. b) applying said configuration parameters, within said step of processing, to control the conversion of each of said predetermined network data packets, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 39, “*configured policy*”).

31. Referencing claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said step of obtaining includes negotiating, by a fourth processor, a set of configuration parameters for a predetermined logical connection established through said network gateway between said first and second networks and wherein said step of applying includes selecting said set of configuration parameters with respect to a predetermined network packet associated with said predetermined logical connection, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 39, “*configured policy*”).

32. Referencing claim 12, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches

33. a) distributing, by said fourth processor to said first processor, said set of configuration parameters, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 39, “*configured policy*”); and

34. b) associating, by said first processor, said set of configuration parameters with said predetermined network packet such that said set of configuration parameters is passed, in combination with said predetermine network packet by said step of selectively distributing, to a predetermined one of said plurality of second processors, (e.g., col. 8, lines 40 – 59).

35. Referencing claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches
36. a) distributing, by said fourth processor to said second processors, said set of configuration parameters, (e.g., col. 8, lines 8 – 39, “*configured policy*”); and
37. b) associating, by a predetermined one of said second processors, said set of configuration parameters with said predetermined network packet as passed by said step of selectively distributing, to said predetermined one of said plurality of second processors, (e.g., col. 7, lines 23 – 44 & col. 8, lines 40 – 59).
38. Claims 16 – 18 and 21 – 24 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

39. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

40. Claims 7, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Almulhem as applied to claims 1 – 6, 8 and 10 – 12 above, and in view of Arrow et al. (6226751) (hereinafter Arrow).

Art Unit: 2143

41. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem does not specifically teach said data form conversion engine includes an encryption engine. Arrow teaches said data form conversion engine includes an encryption engine, (e.g., col. 10, lines 21 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, combine Arrow with Almulhem because a strong encryption scheme can essentially guarantees privacy.

42. As per claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said compute intensive data processing function one or a combination of functions consisting of protocol translation, (e.g., col. 7, lines 23 – 44). Almulhem does not specifically teach said compute intensive data processing function one or a combination of functions selected from a group consisting of data encryption, decryption, compression and decompression. Arrow teaches said compute intensive data processing function one or a combination of functions selected from a group consisting of data encryption, decryption, compression and decompression, (e.g., col. 10, lines 21 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Arrow with Almulhem because of similar reasons stated above, furthermore utilizing compression formats requires less space than sending data uncompressed.

43. Claim 14 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

44. Claims 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Almulhem and Arrow as applied to claims 8, 10 – 12 and 14 above, and in view of Booth, III et al. (6668282) (hereinafter Booth).

45. As per claim 15, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem and Arrow do not specifically teach said compute intensive data processing function implements a conversion between an IP protocol and an IPsec protocol. Booth teaches said compute intensive data processing function implements a conversion between an IP protocol and an IPsec protocol, (e.g., col. 2, lines 25 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Booth with the combine system of Almulhem and Arrow because a big advantage of IPsec is that security arrangements could be handled without requiring changes to individual user computers.

46. Claims 19, 20 and 25 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Almulhem as applied to claims 16 – 18 and 21 above, and in view of Booth.

47. As per claim 19, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem does not specifically teach said protocol transformation is an implementation of a secure IP protocol. Booth teaches said protocol transformation is an implementation of a secure IP protocol, (e.g., col. 2, lines 25 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Booth with Almulhem because of similar reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

48. As per claim 20 as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem does not specifically teach said logical connection is a virtual private network and wherein said protocol transformation implements a conversion between an IP protocol and an IPsec protocol. Booth teaches said logical connection is a virtual private network and wherein said protocol transformation implements a conversion between an IP protocol and an IPsec protocol, (e.g., col. 2, lines 25 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Booth with Almulhem because of similar reasons stated above.

49. As per claim 26, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Almulhem teaches said control processor is coupled through said switch fabric to transfer said protocol processing parameters to a data table stored by said ingress processor, wherein said ingress processor dynamically attaches headers selectively containing said protocol processing parameters to data packets prior to transfer to said parallel array of protocol processors, the selection of said protocol processing parameters being dependent on information contained in respective data packets, (e.g., col. 9, lines 22 – 58).

50. Claims 25 and 27 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2143

51. Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

52. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Almulhem does not show any additional "data packet processor that perform a data processing function over data contained within predetermined data packets.

53. As to part 1, the Applicant is asked to draw their attention to the prior art of record as cited above. In which one can see that the prior art of Almulhem teaches the limitations of claims 1 – 6, 8, 10 – 13, 16 – 18 and 21 – 24. More specifically Almulhem teaches multiple processors that process packets and the data within such as protocols, EPI, IFM, ECP. These processors along with other processors mentioned above teach "data packet processing". Furthermore, the claim language of "a plurality of data packets processors coupled through a data switch fabric between network connection processors" can also be interpreted in the same light as discussed above in regards to the multiple processors coupled together to perform data packet processing.

54. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that the references fail to provide any motivation to even consider combination of Arrow and Almulhem.

55. As to part 2, Applicant in many instances states that the motivations is simply a truism, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed

Art Unit: 2143

invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

57. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Booth and Almulhem, together or in further combination with Arrow, fail to teach or suggest using a plurality of dedicated data packet processors or, further, any way of incorporating such a plurality through an internal switch-fabric to perform compute intensive packet data stream processing with any expectation of success.

58. As to part 3, Applicant is again asked to look at the prior art of the Office Action stated above. There are multiple processors that have been described that process packets that are taught by Almulhem, Arrow and Booth alone or in combination.

59. All other Remarks fall in similar response to what is state above.

Conclusion

60. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2143

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE

DC


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100